



Official

Applicants' Claim 1 recites: "[a] display device comprising a first substrate which is provided with a conductor pattern for electrically connecting pixels, and having a laminar substrate having opposed sides which are both provided with electrically conducting patterns, which patterns are electrically connected via at least one through-connection between the opposed sides of the laminar substrate."

Ueda, fails to recite or suggest: 1) a laminar substrate, 2) electrically conducting patterns on opposite sides of the laminar substrate, and 3) an electrical connection via at least one through-connection between the opposed sides of the laminar substrate. Rather, Col. 21, lines 19-25 of Ueda describe a double-coated tape adhered to the face of the conductor layer which has no parts mounted on its surface side. This tape to which Ueda refers is merely double-coated with an adhesive, and not with electrically conducting patterns on opposite sides. Further, Ueda describes electrical connection between a first and second substrate with an electrical connection through holes (see, e.g., Col. 5, lines 9-24), however, the first and second substrates are not analogous to a laminar substrate with electrically conducting patterns on opposite sides because the substrates are separate distinct layers, as opposed to a single, double-sided layer.

Gofuku only recites at least one substrate having a laminar structure (see, e.g., Col. 2, lines 35-47). Gofuku fails to recite

S:\WX\Amendments\17326.amd1.doc

or suggest 1) the laminar substrate having opposed sides which are both provided with electrically conducting patterns, and 2) the patterns being electrically connected via at least one through-connection between the opposed sides of the laminar substrate. Consequently, the combination of Ueda and Gofuku fails to recite or suggest all the limitations of Applicants' Claim 1, and also teaches away from Applicants Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 1 is believed patentable over Ueda in view of Gofuku for at least these reasons.

Further, it appears that the rejection combines two references using Applicants' invention as a blueprint. This constitutes an impermissible rejection for the additional reason that an obviousness rejection cannot be maintained without improper hindsight by "use[ing] the claimed invention itself as a blueprint for piecing together elements in the prior art to defeat the patentability of the claimed invention," see *In Re Denis Rouffet*, 47 USPQ.2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998). This improper hindsight indicates an improper means by which to reject a claim.

Claims 2-10 each depend from independent Claim 1 discussed above and are, therefore, believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, however, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and should be individually considered on its own merits.

S:\WX\Amendments\17326.amd1.doc

3